



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,831	12/27/2000	Stephen Heisig	YOR920000705US1	6296

7590 08/19/2005

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,831

Applicant(s)

HEISIG ET AL.

Examiner

VAN H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

D

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-5 and 10-17 are presented for execution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-5 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
4. Specification does not explicitly describe nor is sufficiently clear for one of ordinary skill in art to recognize the following steps as recited in claims 1 and 17:
 - provides a plurality of services that permits coding of a thinner application, *which includes at least one of said protocol adapters, without responsibility for coding or providing said services.*
5. The Examiner could not locate the details of these steps within the specification

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-5 and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **De Borst et al.** (U.S. 6,173,327) in view of **Austin** (U.S. 6,763,395)

9. **As to claim 1:**

- a. De Borst teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a computer system (*e.g., an Information Matrix computer 40, col.4, line 52-53 and fig.1*) coupled to work stations operated by remote clients (*fig.1*) comprising:
- (i) an object server container (*e.g., INFORMATION MATRIX 69, fig. 5*) that comprises a plurality of server objects (*e.g., HTTP GATEWAY 137, GOPHER GATEWAY 139, FTP GATEWAY 141, LOCAL FILE SERVER 143, fig. 5*) relating to specific, respective object servers (*e.g., HTTP, GOPHER, NNTP; fig. 5*) of the workstations;
 - (ii) a protocol adapter framework (*e.g., Adapter abstractions; col.7, lines 55-59 and fig. 5*) that provides access to the server objects

from the remote clients (*Fig. 5*), that comprises a plurality of protocol adapters (*e.g., a Hypertext Transport Protocol Adapter 131, a Gopher protocol adapter 133, and a Network News Transport Protocol Adapter 135; col. 7, lines 55-59 and fig. 5*), that supports one or more appropriate arbitrary protocols (*e.g., fig.5 shows HTTP ADAPTER 131 supporting HTTP; GOPHER ADAPTER 133 supporting GOPHER protocol; and NTTP ADAPTER 135 supporting NNTP; fig. 5*) between the clients and the server objects (*fig.5*), and that responds to client requests (*e.g., incoming requests; fig.5*) in the arbitrary protocols received via the protocol adapters (*fig.5*) to derive therefrom method requests on an object residing within at least one of the object server (*e.g., the Adapter abstraction provides a method for requesters to retrieve information from the Information matrix 69; col.7, lines 49-51*).

- b. De Borst does not explicitly teach permits coding of a thinner application, which includes at least one of said protocol adapters, without responsibility for coding or providing said services.
- c. Austin teaches permits coding of a thinner application, which includes at least one of said protocol adapters, without responsibility for coding or providing said services (see the Abstract and col.2, line 57-col.3, line 4).

Art Unit: 2194

- d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Austin and De Borst because Austin's teaching would have provided code that a user may easily install and use to view a wide variety of types of data from a wide variety of data source types.

10. **As to claim 2:**

- a. De Borst teaches a web server (*e.g., HTTP GATEWAY 137; fig. 5*). De Borst, however, does not specifically teach a video server.
- b. Austin teaches a video server (*see video discussion, beginning at col. 4, line 17*).

11. **As to claim 3:**

- a. De Borst teaches a web browser (*e.g., WWW BROWSER 49; fig. 1 and col. 5, line 1*).
- b. Additionally, De Borst teach a video display terminal (*col. 1, lines 60-61*). There must be a video player included in De Borst's system for playing a video file on the video display terminal. De Borst, however, is silent on a video player.
- c. Austin teaches a video player (*see video discussion, beginning at col. 4, line 30*).

12. **As to claim 4:**

De Borst teaches the protocol adapter framework includes HTTP adapter (*e.g., HTTP adapter 131; fig. 5*).

13. **As to claim 5:**

- a. De Borst does teach "additional Adapter abstractions could be added for other types of information retrieval requests" (*col. 7, lines 54-60*). De Borst, however, is silent on a video protocol adapter.

Art Unit: 2194

b. Austin teaches a video protocol adapter (*see adapters discussion, beginning at col. 4, line 45*).

14. **As to claim 10:**

De Borst teaches the object server container provides services (*e.g., gateways and servers are referred to as "information providers" since both provide information to Adapters; col.7, line 62-col.8, line 1*), and wherein the server objects are operable to access the services (*e.g., fig.5 shows services are providing by HTTP GATEWAY 137, GOPHER GATEWAY 139, FTP GATEWAY 141, and LOCAL FILE SERVER 145*).

15. **As to claim 11:**

De Borst teaches ones of the server objects relate to specific, respective ones of the arbitrary protocols that are used by specific, respective object servers of the workstations to access corresponding ones of the server objects (*e.g., fig.5 shows HTTP GATEWAY 137 relates to HTTP; GOPHER GATEWAY 139 relates to GOPHER protocol for retrieving and satisfying requests from clients*).

16. **As to claim 12**

De Borst teaches the method requests (*e.g., incoming HTTP request, incoming GOPHER request; fig. 5*) are for the services (*e.g., outgoing HTTP request, outgoing GOPHER request; fig. 5*).

17. **As to claim 13:**

De Borst teaches the services run in a first protocol (*e.g., TCP; col.4, lines 51-57*) in the object server container, and wherein the first protocol differs from the arbitrary protocols (*e.g., HTTP, GOPHER, and NNTP; fig. 5*).

18. **As to claim 14:**

De Borst teaches the protocol adapter framework processes an output generated by one of the object servers in response to a client request for transport to the requesting client according to a transport protocol expected by the requesting client (*e.g., the Adapter abstraction includes an adapter component that provides the logic for accepting a request and translating the request ... provides the logic for returning a reply to the requestor... a reply can be created by taking the context and producing a protocol-specific reply; col.14, lines 27-39*).

19. **As to claim 15:**

De Borst teaches the transport protocol is selected from the group consisting of: an arbitrary protocol (*e.g., GOPHER protocol; fig.5*) of the requesting client and a second protocol (*e.g., Internet protocol; col.4, lines 51-57*) that differs from the arbitrary protocol of the requesting client.

20. **As to claim 16:**

De Borst teaches said services are selected from, among other things, character set translation (*see translating discussion, beginning at col. 14, line 26*).

21. **As to claim 17:**

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, De Borst further teaches said object server container provides services that run in a first protocol in said object server container wherein said server objects are operable to access said services, and wherein said first protocol differs from arbitrary protocols between the clients and the server objects (*see fig.5 and the accompanying text beginning at col.7,*

line 40); and wherein said protocol adapter framework processes an output generated by one of said object servers in response to a client request for transport to said requesting client according to a transport protocol that is expected by the requesting client, wherein the transport protocol differs from an arbitrary protocol of the requesting client (*seecol. 7, line 49-col. 8, line 60*).

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 and 10-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
24. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the


Art Unit: 2194

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

vhn


MENNG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100